

schooling at the University of Minnesota, until World War I interrupted.

Three years of ROTC there gave him a leg up on a lieutenant's bars. In France, he was an artilleryman. His job was to ride a wicker basket under a rough, hydrogen-filled balloon, held by a cable and linked by a primitive telephone to the gun batteries, overlooking the battlefield. There, he observed the fall of the artillery shells his battery mates were firing and tell them how to adjust their fire to bring it on target.

Of course, such balloons like his were sitting ducks, even for the primitive planes of the time.

When the war ended, the army found his ability to speak German useful and kept him in Europe. He remained overseas for 18 months in all, much of the time interpreting for others or dealing directly with the local German population. He also knew Paris, Berlin, other German cities, and visited England and Ireland. In Rome, the ambassador asked him to join his staff, but Ev was homesick for Pekin.

Thus, young Lt. Dirksen returned to Pekin and Bohnchefiddle at age 24, with an extraordinary range of experiences. He was now a college man, a combat veteran and an ex-officer who had traveled, often in very sophisticated circles, in postwar Europe.

Back home, he married a Pekin girl and launched his remarkable political career as the youngest person ever elected to the Pekin City Council.

As city councilman, he was a young man dealing with a rapidly changing world. Streets needed to be paved for the growing number of those new motor cars. The fire department needed trucks to replace the horse-drawn rigs. The aging streetcar, one car running back and forth on a single track, needed replacement with bus service.

Power plant were under construction bringing electricity. The Edison resolution was on, and radio was waiting in the wings. These were not hypothetical or abstract problems to be solved abstractly for the young councilman. He was intimately involved with the reality of finance for technology and the even tougher reality of the effects and demands new technology and dramatic change made on the city workers and the public.

When he grappled with these problems as a councilman, he also worked delivering his brothers' bread to 50 small groceries scattered about town. Everybody knew his route, and at many a stop he confronted people with problems to take to their councilman. Before he went to the national macrocosm, this man had a thorough and heavy dose of the microcosm.

Thus, the nature of the man was well-founded long before he became one of that city's best-loved figures, before he crafted the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 and brought over the votes to pass it with him, before he won a Grammy for recording "Gallant Men," before he was the confidante of presidents both Republican and Democrat, and before he became a darling of the once-skeptical Washington press corps.

He brought to Washington the prestige of being the Congress' best orator, a skill founded and practiced in Pekin and which largely won for him his original seat in the House of Representatives in the first place.

He also brought the attention to detail, the realism, of Bohnchefiddle, and was, undoubtedly, the most skilled parliamentarian in the Senate of his time. He knew how the system worked in every detail, and he knew who was the person that counted, the person to talk to, not only in the Senate, but in every department of the national administration.

Finally, he made many friends and no enemies in the best tradition of the small town

where he grew up, and where some of his local political foes were also lifelong personal friends.

When Everett Dirksen died, the President of the United States gave the eulogy—proclaiming that Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen had more impact on history than many presidents.

That he was, and he didn't learn that in Washington. That was the boy from Bohnchefiddle.

#### SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations. Observation No. 1 is that I believe that the struggle we are in is a very significant and fundamental one. This is not a testosterone test. It is not an ego test. It is a fundamental struggle.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the 7-year balanced budget plan offered by my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it contains three significant features.

No. 1, they significantly change the function, nature, and role of the Federal Government in the lives of people in this country. Nothing can be more fundamental than redefining the nature and the role of the Federal Government. I would argue that when we put down the Articles of Confederation and moved to a constitutional government, that brilliant minds thought that it was an important function, the role of the Federal Government in people's lives. To redefine that is very fundamental.

Second, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to significantly reduce the size of the Federal Government and, third, significantly reduce the revenues designed to carry out the business of Federal governance.

Nothing can be more fundamental than that struggle. The give and take that is necessary to resolve those fundamental problems, in this gentleman's humble opinion, cannot be dealt with in the context of an artificial crisis that wreaks havoc and brings pain and creates peril in the lives of people who offer the services and people who receive the services of the Federal Government.

We ought to dignify the significance of this fundamental struggle by moving beyond this crisis, and I would echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues who suggested we ought to pass a continuing resolution, and yet with all due respect, I think my colleagues are going in the wrong direction.

The first factor that contributed to the deficit was the \$260 some odd billion tax cut to the wealthy during the Reagan era. But rather than pass a simplified progressive tax based on the notion that the people most able to pay, pay the most, what we see here is a bill that passed the House that origi-

nally had a tax cut of \$305 billion. Now we are talking about a tax cut of \$245 billion to the wealthy. Been there. Done that. That is a mistake.

No. 2, the rapid rise in the military budget during the Reagan era that took us from \$170-some-odd-billion climbed up over \$300 billion and leveled out for the 10 years of the decade of the 1980's. We find ourselves in the context of a post-cost war world where we ought to be downsizing the military budget, but what does this budget do? It added \$7 billion over and above the President's request, and it adds to the military budget during a period when the United States and its allies outspend the rest of the world 4 to 1. It seems to me that that is going in the wrong direction.

The third contributing factor to the deficit was the rapid rise in health care costs. But rather than we embrace a national health care policy based upon the principles of comprehensiveness and universality, what we see here is a challenge to Medicare, a challenge to Medicaid, and no effort to bring this country to the 21st century with a coherent, rational and comprehensive approach to national health care.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a major contributing factor to the deficit is high unemployment. Depending upon which economist we subscribe to, for each point we reduce the unemployment rate, we reduce the budget deficit by \$25 to \$55 billion each point we drop, but rather than embrace a policy of full employment, we embrace a policy of restricting employment, and I would suggest that jobs are not created in a vacuum, Mr. Speaker.

A society generates employment to the extent to which we are prepared to come together to solve other social problems. We address the problems of transportation in this country; you generate employment in the field of transportation. We address the issue of education in this country; we generate employment. My point is that to the extent to which we are prepared to spend resources to solve the social problems of this country, we solve that problem and we generate employment. The 7-year budget plan in my opinion goes in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying the process is flawed. We have created an incredible crisis here and, No. 2, on substance we are going down the wrong road that does not take us toward reduction of the deficit. Ultimately, I think it is going to contribute to it.

#### MR. PRESIDENT, IT IS TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I came down out of my apartment this morning and picked up the Washington Post on the front porch and, as I looked through it, I turned finally to page A-